

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. By way of the present response, claims 1, 7, 8, 15-17, 22 and 25 have been amended. Claims 1-29 currently are pending.

The Examiner objected to claims 17, 22 and 25 for containing informalities. In response, these claims have been changed to improve readability and to otherwise address the concerns expressed on pages 2-3 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the claims.

The Office Action includes a rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by the Mamiya patent. (U.S. Patent No. 6,690,415). This rejection is respectfully traversed, insofar as it may be considered to apply to amended claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the manipulation member provided to the camera is operative to input a command regarding control of a screen for display on a display of the camera and that the camera controller provided to the camera operates to detect an operation of the manipulation member and transmit a signal representing the command input by the manipulation member to the computer. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, in the specification at pages 18-26 and in Figures 8(a) to 14. It is respectfully submitted that the Mamiya patent does not describe this combination of features set forth in the claim 1.

For instance, the citations from columns 3-4 the Mamiya patent relied upon in the Office Action do not mention a camera display, much less "a manipulation member provided to said camera and operative to input a command regarding control of a screen for display *on a display of the camera*," as claimed. It necessarily follows that the Mamiya patent also does not describe the claimed features of a controller provided to a computer for controlling a screen of a display functioning together with the computer, based on the signal received from the camera.

In contrast, the Mamiya patent describes that a controller in a computer (i.e., CPU 121 of PC 120) receives an interrupt signal after depressing a release button of a camera (i.e., release button 118 of camera 110) (column 3, lines 36-48), which causes the computer to send an API message to a message queue. According to the Mamiya patent, the API message includes an instruction for an application running on the computer to perform a freeze process (column 3, lines 49-54). However, the Mamiya patent is silent with respect to a camera display and therefore does not describe operating this button to control a screen on a camera display. Additionally, the relied-upon description in Mamiya of a computer controller copying image data from the camera memory to its main memory and thereafter displaying the image data (column 4, lines 25-32) in response to receiving an interrupt signal does not describe, nor does it imply, that the computer controller operates to control a screen on a computer display based on the signal received from the camera, which represents the command input by the manipulation member.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is considered to be allowable.

The Office Action also includes a rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as allegedly being unpatentable over Kodak Digital Science DC120 Zoom Digital Camera User's Guide (hereinafter referred to as "the Kodak document") in view of the Duggan patent (U.S. Patent No. 5,584,035). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 recites that a computer executes the steps of receiving a signal transmitted by a camera, which is connected to the computer, and *displaying a folder for storing image data transmitted from the camera* on a display functioning together with the computer, *based on the signal*. In connection with these claimed features, the Office Action refers to the description in the Kodak document of copying an image file to a computer folder by dragging and dropping an image (see, pages 8-3 and 8-4). The Office Action goes on to state, "The Kodak manual is silent with regard to displaying a folder on the computer for storing image data transmitted from the camera." Assuming this statement is referring to the actual claim language "display a folder for storing image data transmitted from the camera on a display

functioning together with the computer, based on the signal,” Applicants agree that the Kodak document fails to teach or suggest such features.

To fill this gap, the rejection relies on the Duggan patent’s disclosure of a user interface for manipulating objects, as shown in Figure 12 and described in column 15, lines 32-67. It is respectfully submitted, however, that the Duggan patent does not remedy the shortcomings of the Kodak document because Duggan does not teach or suggest the claimed step of displaying a folder *for storing image data transmitted from the camera* on a display functioning together with the computer, *based on a signal transmitted from the camera*. Even if one were to consider for the sake of argument that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the Kodak system to allow file movement as taught in the Duggan patent, such hypothetical combination would not have resulted in the combination of features set forth in claim 5.

For instance, the copy operation described in Duggan does not mention displaying a folder based on a signal received from the second machine MC2. To the contrary, the system windows in Duggan appear to be selected by a *user* operating the first machine MC1. Likewise, the Kodak document does not mention or suggest that the “Vacation Pictures” window of the computer is displayed based on any image retrieved from an image folder on the camera. Hence, even when combined, the Kodak and Duggan documents would not have resulted in a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action also includes a rejection of claims 7 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Imaeda (U.S. Patent No. 5,473,366). This rejection is respectfully traversed, to the extent the rejection may be considered to apply to amended claims 7 and 15.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite that the camera controller provided to the camera controls the screen of the image display provided to the camera based on the display data received from the computer while changing the number of pixels of the display data. Support for these changes can be found, for example, in the specification at page 17 and in Figure 4. Claim 15 has been similarly amended to recite that the camera controller for receiving display data transmitted automatically from a computer, when connected to said connector, controls a screen of said image display based on the received data while changing the number of pixels of the display data. It is respectfully submitted that the Imaeda patent's disclosure of a television telephone does not disclose these features as claimed in claims 7 and 15.

As the Imaeda patent does not describe each and every feature set forth in amended claims 7 and 15, these claims as amended are submitted to be patentable.


Claim 8 and 16 have been amended to more clearly define the process of thinning out the display data, without changing the substantive content of these claims.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious over the Imaeda patent in view of Office Notice of alleged well-known processes of thinning out display data. However, claim 16 depends from claim 15. As pointed out above, the Imaeda patent does not describe or suggest all the features of claim 15. Moreover, the asserted well-known subject matter in the Official Notice does not relate to the features of "receiving display data transmitted automatically from a computer ...," as recited in the context of claim 15. Hence, claim 16 also is considered to be patentable.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all the rejections and objections raised in the Office Action have been addressed. As such, the application is in condition for allowance and prompt notification of the same is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: May 27, 2005

By: 
James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28,632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620